



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/806,028

03/22/2004

Robert Karlsson

B 521

1001

22840 7590 06/08/2009
GE HEALTHCARE BIO-SCIENCES CORP.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
800 CENTENNIAL AVENUE
PISCATAWAY, NJ 08855

EXAMINER

GRUN, JAMES LESLIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1641

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/08/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/806,028	Applicant(s) KARLSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES L. GRUN	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,13,17,21,25-30,36 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30,36 and 37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,13,17,21 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1641

The amendment filed 18 March 2009 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 31-35, and 38-44 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 13, 17, 21, 25-30, 36 and 37 remain in the case. Claims 30, 36, and 37 have been withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species or invention. Claims 1, 8, 13, 17, 21, and 25-29 are under examination.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more subsections (e), (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 8, 13, 17, 21, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Cooper et al. (Anal. Biochem. 277: 196, 2000), Niemeyer et al. (Anal. Biochem. 268: 54, 1999), and Nikiforov et al. (US 5,610,287) for reasons of record in the prior rejection of the similar subject matter of these claims.

Applicant's arguments filed 18 March 2009 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Art Unit: 1641

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Notwithstanding applicant's assertions to the contrary, the disclosure of Nikiforov et al. is not limited to hydrophobic interaction binding as the reference clearly teaches that the mechanisms are unknown, but may involve decreasing of electrostatic repulsion between the phosphates of the oligonucleotide and the negatively charged groups on the surface allowing a combination of hydrophobic, ionic and hydrogen bonding to the surface (see e.g. col. 7, lines 33-59, and col. 8, lines 63-67).

Applicant urges that the reagents of Nikiforov et al. would not work on highly charged surfaces. This is not found persuasive for the reasons of record in view of the teachings of the combined references. In particular, Nikiforov et al. teach cationic detergent compositions as an alternative to salt containing compositions for oligonucleotide immobilization to negatively charged surfaces, including for biotinylated oligonucleotide immobilization (see e.g. col. 7 and col. 8, lines 58-67), and Cooper et al. or Niemeyer et al. teach that salt containing solutions were effective for the immobilization of biotinylated oligonucleotides to the same surface as instantly disclosed and claimed. As set forth, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had an extremely reasonable expectation of success in using the cationic detergent reagents of Nikiforov et al. as an alternative in the immobilization methods of Cooper et al. or Niemeyer et al. because Nikiforov et al. had already shown such reagents to be an effective alternative for oligonucleotide immobilization and one would have been motivated to have selected from a limited number of known alternatives to perform the immobilization. Applicant's assertion that

Art Unit: 1641

shielding of electrostatic interactions prevents efficient immobilization to the surface is not understood because immobilization is by binding between binding pair members (i.e. biotin and (strept)avidin) and not to the surface directly.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN **TWO MONTHS** OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE **THREE-MONTH** SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN **SIX MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Art Unit: 1641

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Grun, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0821. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya, SPE, can be contacted at (571) 272-0806.

The phone number for official facsimile transmitted communications to TC 1600, Group 1640, is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application, or requests to supply missing elements from Office communications, should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. L. G./

James L. Grun, Ph.D.

Examiner, Art Unit 1641

June 8, 2009

/Ann Y. Lam/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641

June 4, 2009